

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20505

20 JUN 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: Secretary of Defense 25X1  
Assistant Secretary of Defense  
for International Security Policy

SUBJECT: Remarks of [ ] on Soviet Fears of  
U.S. Intentions and Their Impact on Arms  
Control Negotiations [ ]

25X1

Attached for your information is a report on the above  
subject. It is for your background use only and no further  
distribution or extraction of this information can be made  
without prior approval of this Agency.

25X1

[ ]  
John H. Stein  
Deputy Director for Operations

25X1

SECRET

25X1

6-134

**Page Denied**

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Denied

Rowland Evans and Robert Novak

# 'Scalping the Pentagon'

According to a high-ranking Americanologist in the Kremlin, the Soviet leadership privately charges Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and one of his top aides with having drawn up a "master plan" to destroy the Soviet Union.

Georgi Arbatov, head of the renowned Kremlin-run U.S.A. Institute, is known to have expressed that view of the Kremlin's antagonism toward Weinberger and Assistant Defense Secretary Richard Perle within the last six months. It has come into the hands of U.S. intelligence agencies, but by what means is not known. It was Arbatov's personal opinion that the removal of either Weinberger or Perle would be a "favorable development" and a "positive sign."

Disclosure of the secret Arbatov file on scalping the Pentagon happened to coincide with instructions from President Reagan to top Cabinet officials, including Weinberger and CIA Director William Casey, that he intends to follow "a negotiating track" on U.S.-Soviet concerns. But Moscow's call to fire Weinberger and Perle may backfire on Arbatov by raising their go-slow influence within an administration deeply divided over arms control.

The destruction of the Soviet Union, Arbatov said, is planned not by nuclear war but by "other" means: presumably economic and political subversion, military rearmament too fast for the Soviets to match and tougher restraints on sales of technology.

The Kremlin's top strategic specialist on how the Soviet Union should deal with its superpower rival denied that the election campaign had anything to do with it. "Let it be known," he said, "that it is the view of the Soviet leadership that the American administration does not want improved relations with Moscow and therefore for the foreseeable future the Soviet Union cannot move on arms control."

All this transpired before the president named Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko in the White House last month. Since then, and particularly since his landslide reelection on Nov. 6, the president has been moving fast—too fast, some officials believe—toward arms control talks with Moscow under a vague, White House-proclaimed "umbrella" formula.

The "umbrella" formula will send Secre-

tary of State George Shultz to Geneva early next year for across-the-board talks with Gromyko. Paul Nitze, Reagan's negotiator in the failed effort to halt Soviet deployment of the European-targeted SS20 missile, might become Shultz's nuts-and-bolts negotiator starting during the preliminary "umbrella" talks.

In addition, Reagan is all but certain to ask Weinberger to designate a Pentagon specialist to sit through all the negotiations—not Perle, but perhaps Defense Undersecretary Fred Iklé. Whoever is chosen must be acceptable to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

This careful preparation for what the president is privately calling his "negotiating track" looks neater and tidier than it is. Even with Reagan's strong emphasis to Weinberger and Casey that he is committed to negotiations—that, in the words of one top aide, it is his "frame of mind"—caution about new arms control agreements dominates the CIA and the Pentagon. At Shultz's State Department, the mood is different: optimistic over possibilities for breakthroughs.

Indeed, administration insiders sympathetic to the Pentagon's arms control caution say that the State Department's private judgment of Weinberger and Perle on the nuclear issue is just as negative as the view from the Kremlin portrayed by Georgi Arbatov.

The report of Arbatov's vicious criticism of the president's top Pentagon arms-control planners may actually strengthen them. That would produce a backlash against the Kremlin in the administration's bureaucratic struggle for the mind and soul of Ronald Reagan. Pro-arms control diplomats might be disadvantaged at the hands of Pentagon-CIA skeptics who are convinced that the United States was taken to the cleaners in earlier SALT agreements and must insist on leak-proof verification procedures for all future agreements.

One fact was emerging with clarity here following high-level study of the Arbatov file: however *persona non grata* Weinberger and Perle may be in George Shultz's State Department, the Kremlin's top Americanologist has ended all prospect of their leaving their posts any time soon.

©1984, News Group Chicago, Inc.

performing. Night (that runaway) never may wink and Romeo/Leap to these arms untalked of and unseen? No longer is Romeo impatient to lie with Juliet. Cooled down by Scott, Foresman, he wants only to "be" with her.

The publisher admitted that the teacher's guide was in error. Words had been altered. And the Minneapolis high school told its teachers to inform the students that there is more to "Romeo and Juliet" than meets the innocent eye in this smoothly arranged Scott, Foresman anthology. But as for those who felt injury had been done to young Montague and Capulet, the president of the firm, Richard Morgan, instructed reporter Wendy Tai that Scott, Foresman pub-

James J. Kilpatrick

## The Work of Bishops

A couple of weeks ago the National Conference of Catholic Bishops delivered itself of a 120-page draft of a pastoral letter on economic justice. I had intended to drop the topic in the round file, on the reasonable grounds that any outfit that fathers the bastard verb "to marginalize" should be charitably ignored. But further reflection prompts a few observations.

The bishops find it morally unacceptable that so many persons should be living in poverty in so rich a land. To be "poor," their draft letter says, "means being denied full participation in the economic, social and political life of society." It means "being marginalized." It is here that the bishops begin to get a bit barmy, for no one—not even a Catholic bishop—enjoys "full participation" in the economic, social and political life of society. All of us are on one margin or another. By such rubbery yardsticks we are all poor.

Put such quibbles aside. Beyond dispute, some millions of Americans are poor by any definition. Why did they get this way? And what should be done about it?

The bishops assert that "everyone knows the significance of economic relationships," but obviously this is not so. The bishops themselves seem not to have even the foggiest notion of why some are poor and some are rich. Their gentle notion is that all men are, or at least morally ought to be, substantially equal in this world's goods. The reality is that some of God's creatures are more ambitious, more talented, more productive, more industrious and just plain luckier than others. There is no respectable authority for the proposition that the poor we shall always have with us; and as long as we preserve a free society we shall always have the relatively rich with us also.

Why do people work? Tell us, gentlemen. Why? I suspect the bishops have not thought this out, and this may be because bishops never have had to work in the way that others work. Priests have the greatest job security on earth; they are more secure than federal judges, crowned

Michael Barone

## Why Don't Blacks

Start with an election statistic: the number of black legislators in the United States is static. There will be 372 blacks in state legislatures next year, the same number as this year; the number of blacks in Congress dropped from 22 to 21.

This contrasts with what happened in the 1970s, when the number of black

majority-black constituencies any time soon. The Voting Rights Act, as recently reaffirmed by the Supreme Court, maximizes the number of majority-black legislative districts already, and fewer central cities are approaching a racial tipping point than were in the 1965-80 period.

The victory of Harold Washington for

Thomas Bradley has been mayor three times in 17-perce Los Angeles and won 48 perce vote for governor in 7-perce California.

Whites are willing to vote right black candidates in the circumstances. And there certain lack of non-black constituencie